

Quality assessment criteria for survey research reports

Category	Item	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
Title and abstract			
	Is the design of the study stated in the title and/or abstract?	Line 34-37, P1-2	Abstract, para 1
Introduction			
	a) Is there an explanation of why the research is necessary, placing the study in context of previous work in relevant fields?	Line 65-71, P2-3	Intro, para 1
	b) Is the purpose or aim of the paper explained?	Line 75-78, P3	Intro, para 2
Methods			
Research tool	a) Is the questionnaire described?	Line 99-113, P3-4	Methods, para 3-5
	b) If an existing tool was used, are its psychometric properties presented?	Line 99-113, P3-4	Methods, para 3-5
	c) If an existing tool was used, are references to the original work provided?	Line 88-90, P3	Methods, para 2
	d) If a new tool was used, are the procedures used to develop and pre-test provided?	N/A	N/A
	e) If a new tool was used, have its reliability and validity been reported?	N/A	N/A
	f) Is a description of the scoring procedures provided?	Line 69-77, P4	Methods, para 3
Sample selection	a) Is there a description of the survey population and the sample frame used to identify this population?	Line 86-87, P3	Methods, para 2
	b) Do the authors provide a description of how representative the sample is of the underlying population?	Line 86-87, P3	Methods, para 2
	c) Is a sample size calculation or rationale/justification for the sample size presented?	Line 125-128, P4	Results, para 1
Survey administration	a) Mode of administration?	Line 86-87, P3	Methods, para 2
	b) Do the authors provide information on the type of contact and how many attempts were made to contact subjects (i.e., prenotification by letter or telephone, reminder postcard, duplicate questionnaire with reminder)?	Line 93-95, P3	Methods, para 2
	c) Do the authors report whether incentives were provided (financial or other)?	Line 94-95, P3	Methods, para 2
	d) Is there a description of who approached potential participants (e.g., identification of who signed the covering letter)?	Line 91-94, P3	Methods, para 2

Analysis	a) Is the method of data analysis described?	Line 116-121, P4	Methods, para 4
	b) Do the authors provide methods for analysis of nonresponse error?	Line 125-127, P4	Results, para 1
	c) Is the method for calculating response rate provided?	Line 125-127, P4	Results, para 1
	d) Are definitions provided for complete versus partial completions?	Line 95-96, P3	Methods, para 2
	e) Are the methods for handling item missing data provided?	Line 95-96, P3	Methods, para 2
Results			
	a) Is the response rate reported?	Line 125-127, P4	Results, para 1
	b) Are all respondents accounted for?	Line 125-127, P4	Results, para 1
	c) Is information given on how nonrespondents differ from respondents?	Line 125-127, P4	Results, para 1
	d) Are the results clearly presented?	Line 125-157, P4-5	Results, para 1-6
	e) Do the results address the objective(s)?	Line 125-157, P4-5	Results, para 1-6
Discussion			
	a) Are the results summarized with reference to the study objectives?	Line 163-193, P5-6	Discussion, para 1-3
	b) Are the strengths of the study stated?	Line 197-209, P6-7	Discussion, para 3
	c) Are the limitations of the study (taking into account potential sources of bias or imprecision) stated?	Line 211-218, P7	Discussion, para 4
	d) Is there explicit discussion of the generalizability (external validity) of the results?	Line 189-196, P6	Discussion, para 2
Ethical quality indicators			
	a) Study funding reported?	Line 230-233, P7	Acknowledgement, para 1
	b) Research Ethics Board (REB) review reported?	Line 81-83, P3	Methods, para 1
	c) Reporting of subject consent procedures?	Line 81-83, P3	Methods, para 1

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp-22-539>

*As the checklist was provided upon initial submission, the page number/line number reported may be changed due to copy editing and may not be referable in the published version. In this case, the section/paragraph may be used as an alternative reference.